

Slavery  
H 297  
**A LETTER**

**TO THE RIGHT REV. L. SILLIMAN IVES,**

**BISHOP OF THE PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL CHURCH IN THE STATE OF  
NORTH CAROLINA,**

*Occasioned by his late Address to the Convention of his Diocese.*

**BY WILLIAM JAY.**

**NOTICE TO THE THIRD EDITION.**

THE following letter has been heretofore published under the signature of "A Protestant Episcopalian." A new edition being called for, the writer has yielded to the advice of his friends, in giving it under his own name. He has no idea that he will thus add any weight whatever to his arguments, but he does hope that the confidence of the reader in the accuracy of the facts, and the fidelity of the quotations will be strengthened by the author's acknowledgment of his responsibility for them.

It has been often alleged that anti-slavery writers exaggerate and misrepresent the character of American slavery. If the charge be true, their conduct is no less foolish than immoral, for when the confessions of the accused are superabundant and overwhelming, it is gratuitous wickedness to suborn witnesses. It will be observed that the only testimony on which the writer has relied, is that voluntarily given by Southern witnesses; and he is utterly unconscious of having perverted or colored it in the slightest degree.

Feb. 7, 1848.

**RIGHT REVEREND SIR :**

History tells us of a certain Bishop who was taken prisoner in battle, while fighting against the King of France. The Pope, indignant that a prelate of the church should be held as a captive, demanded his instant liberation. To this mandate the King replied by sending his Holiness the Bishop's blood-stained armor, with the words of Scripture, "This have we found; know now, whether it be thy son's coat or no."

And surely the ambassador of HIM who came to preach deliverance to the captive, and liberty to them that are bruised, as effectually disguises and denies his holy office, when he chants the praises of Slavery, with all its inseparable and unutterable abominations, as when he arrays himself in the garment of the warrior, and participates in the work of human butchery. Of all the Bishops of the Church, you alone aspire to the championship of human bondage. Your brother of Texas reposes on the laurels he has won in the service of the slaveholders. Others of your Reverend and Right Reverend brethren are content to enjoy the unrequited toils of their bondmen, without provoking the attention of the public to the discrepancy between their religion and their practice. You alone throw down the gauntlet to the whole of Christendom beyond the slave region. It was not

enough that you had already endorsed with the whole weight of your episcopal influence the frantic assertions, that "NO MEN NOR SET OF MEN IN OUR DAY, UNLESS THEY CAN PRODUCE A NEW REVELATION FROM HEAVEN; ARE ENTITLED TO PRONOUNCE SLAVERY WRONG," and that "SLAVERY, AS IT EXISTS AT THE PRESENT DAY, IS AGREEABLE TO THE ORDER OF DIVINE PROVIDENCE;" you must introduce the subject into the council of your church, and entertain your convention with a picture of the blessedness of North Carolina slaves, and with sneers at the wailing of your fellow Christians over their "imaginary" suffering. Should we seek for the cause of your peculiar ultraism in behalf of human chattelism, we should probably find it in the tendency of human nature, under a change of position, to vibrate from one extreme to the other; and which is exemplified in the proverbial cruelty and arrogance of the slave, when elevated to the post of DRIVER. Had you, when preparing for the ministry among your native hills of New York, been told that the day would come when you would claim to hold your fellow men as bondmen by the grace of God, and would scoff at the sufferings of Southern slaves, the answer of Hazael to the prophet would have trembled on your lips.

Your late address to the convention of your diocese contained the following extraordinary passages :

"From this place I went, by the request of my friend, Josiah Collins, Esq., directly to the estates on Lake Scuppernong, which had been without stated ministerial services for the greater part of the year. Here, and in the neighboring parish at Pettigrew's chapel, I passed the remainder part of the season of Lent, holding daily services, delivering lectures, and commencing a new course of oral catechetical instructions to the servants. This course is to embrace the prominent events and truths of the Old and New Testaments, as connected with man's fall and redemption, and is designed to follow the oral catechism I have already published. The services here were of the most gratifying character, fully justifying all that has been said and anticipated of the system of religious training heretofore pursued on these plantations. When I saw master and servants standing side by side in the holy services of Passion week—when I saw all secular labor on these plantations suspended on Good Friday, and the cleanly clad multitude thronging the house of prayer, to pay their homage to a crucified Savior—and when I saw, on the blessed Easter morn, the master with his goodly number of servants kneeling with reverent hearts and devout thanksgivings to take the bread of life at the same altar—I could not but indulge the hope that ere long my spirit may be refreshed by such scenes

in every part of my diocese; while I could not help believing that, had some of our brethren of other lands been present, they would have been induced to change the note of their wailing over imaginary suffering, into the heartfelt exclamation, 'Happy are the people that are in such a case; yea, blessed are the people *who have the Lord for their God.*'

"Often, at such times, have I wished for the presence of my friend the good Bishop of Oxford, as I have felt assured that, could he but once witness what it is my happiness to witness, though in a too imperfect state, his manly heart would prompt him to ask instant pardon of the American church, for his having spoken so harshly upon a subject which he so imperfectly understood; and that he would perceive that his Christian sympathy might find a much more natural vent in efforts to remove the cruel oppressions of the factory system in his own country, and his Christian indignation a much more legitimate object of rebuke in the English churchmen who have helped to rivet that system upon their land."

If ever TRUTH is peculiarly obligatory, it is when a Bishop, acting in his high and holy office, addresses a council of the church of God. We are here informed that our brethren of other lands have raised a "note of wailing over IMAGINARY suffering;" and the context forbids us to understand the expression in any other sense than a solemn official declaration that Southern slavery is unattended with real actual suffering!!! The assurance is also avowed, that had the Bishop of Oxford witnessed the scenes at Scuppernong, he would have been prompted to ask instant pardon of the American church, for having spoken so harshly upon a subject which he so imperfectly understood. Such an assurance is no less wonderful than unwarranted. The subject on which the Bishop is accused of having spoken harshly, and without understanding it, is American slavery, and the support afforded it by the American church.

Your address, sir, is the first response made to the Bishop of Oxford's reproof of the American church. So long as it was hoped the reproof would be *suppressed* in this country, a most profound silence was observed respecting it. Scarcely an Episcopalian in the country seemed to know that the history of his church had been written by an eminent English divine. But no sooner is an extract from his history published, bearing upon the horrors of Southern slavery, and the delinquencies of our Bishops and Clergy respecting it, than you think proper to represent him as imperfectly acquainted with the subject, and profess to believe that, if better informed, he would ask instant

pardon of the church for what he had written.\* It is to be regretted, sir, that you found it inexpedient to specify the alleged suffering which you pronounce *imaginary*, or to point out a single mistake into which your good brother of Oxford has fallen, and which would tend in any degree to verify your charge against him, of *imperfectly* understanding his subject. But, sir, there are writers against whom *you*, a Northern man, will not think it decorous to bring a similar charge. The following witnesses, you will perceive, differ from you as to the blessedness of Southern slavery, and dare to call it *wrong*, without waiting for a new revelation from Heaven.

WASHINGTON:—"Your late purchase of an estate in the colony of Cayenne, with a view of emancipating the slaves on it, is a generous and noble proof of your humanity. Would to God a like spirit might diffuse itself generally into the minds of the people of this country."—*Letter to Lafayette, 10th May, 1786.*

JEFFERSON:—"Can the liberties of a nation be thought secure, when we have removed the only firm basis—a conviction in the minds of the people that these liberties are the gift of God—that they are not to be violated but with his wrath? Indeed, I tremble for my country when I reflect that God is just; that his justice cannot sleep for ever; that, considering numbers, nature, and natural means only, a revolution of the wheel of fortune, an exchange of situation is among possible events; that it may become possible by supernatural interference. The Almighty has no attribute which can take side with us in such a contest."—*Notes on Virginia.*

MADISON:—"Many circumstances at the present moment seem to concur in brightening the prospects of the Society, and cherishing the hope that the time will come when the *dreadful calamity* which has so long afflicted our country, and filled so many with despair, will be gradually removed."—*Letter to American Colonization Society, 29th December, 1831.*

MONROE:—"We have found that this evil (slavery) has preyed upon the very vitals of the community, and has been prejudicial to *all the States* in which it has existed."—*Speech in Virginia Convention.*

WILLIAM PINKNEY:—"It is really matter of astonishment to me,

---

\* No doubt, the whole church of England might with equal propriety be called to ask pardon of her American daughter, as it is to be hoped every one of her Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, most cordially concurs in the propriety and justice of the Bishop of Oxford's reproof. The Bishop of Norwich, in a letter of 19th October, 1840, to an American gentleman who had furnished him with certain papers, including portions of Freeman's Sermon, and Bishop Ives's endorsement of it, remarks: "I have always considered it as an anomaly, that any State professing Christianity could for a moment tolerate a tyranny so utterly at variance with every feeling of justice and humanity; but I never could have believed that any individuals existed, *calling themselves ministers of the gospel*, whose minds were so darkened by prejudice and self-interest as to avow an approval of slavery and its evil consequences, had I not found them so unequivocally confirmed in the documents above mentioned."

that the people of Maryland do not blush at the very name of freedom. Not content with exposing to the world, for near a century, a speaking picture of *abominable oppression*, they are still ingenious to prevent the hand of generosity from robbing it of half its horrors."—*Speech on Slavery in Maryland House of Delegates, 1789.*

PATRICK HENRY:—"It is a debt we owe the purity of our religion, to show that it is at variance with that law which warrants slavery."—*Letter to A. Benezet.*

MANUMISSION SOCIETY OF NORTH CAROLINA:—"In the eastern parts of the State the slaves considerably outnumber the free population. Their situation there is *wretched beyond description*. Impoverished by the mismanagement which we have already attempted to describe, the master, unable to supply his own grandeur and maintain his slaves, puts the unfortunate wretches upon short allowance, scarcely sufficient for their sustenance, so that a great part go half naked and half starved much of their time. . . . Generally, throughout the State, the African is an abused, a monstrously outraged creature."—*Report, 1826.*

JOHN RANDOLPH:—"Sir, I envy neither the head nor the heart of that man, *from the North*, who rises here to defend slavery on principle."—*Speech in Congress, 1829.*

MR. MOORE:—"Slavery as it exists in Virginia, may be regarded as the *heaviest calamity* which has ever fallen to this portion of the human race. One of the evils which arises from it, is the irresistible tendency which it has to undermine and destroy everything like *virtue and morality* in the community."—*Speech in Virginia Legislature, 1832.*

THOMAS M. RANDOLPH:—"It is a practice, and an increasing practice, in parts of Virginia, to REAR SLAVES FOR MARKET. How can an honorable mind, a patriot and a lover of his country, bear to see this Ancient Dominion converted into one vast menagerie, where *men are reared for market like oxen for the shambles*."—*Speech in Virginia Legislature, 1832.*

REV. R. J. BRECKENRIDGE, of Baltimore:—"What is slavery as it exists among us? We reply, it is that condition, enforced by the laws of one half of the States of this confederacy, in which one portion of the community, called masters, is allowed such power over another portion, called slaves, as—

"1. To deprive them of the entire earnings of their own labor, except only so much as is necessary to continue labor itself, by continuing healthy existence—thus committing *clear robbery*.

"2. To reduce them to the necessity of universal concubinage, by denying to them the civil rights of marriage—thus breaking up the dearest relations of life, and encouraging *universal prostitution*.

"3. To deprive them of the means and opportunities of moral and intellectual culture; in many States making it a high penal offence to teach them to read—thus *perpetuating* whatever evil there is that proceeds from ignorance.

"4. To set up between parents and their children an authority higher than the impulse of nature and the *laws of God*, which breaks up the authority of the father over his own offspring, and at pleasure separates the mother at a returnless distance from her child—thus abrogating the clear laws of nature, thus outraging all decency and

justice, and degrading and oppressing thousands upon thousands of beings created like themselves in the image of the Most High God. THIS IS SLAVERY, as it is daily exhibited in every Slave State."—*African Repository*, 1834.

SYNOD OF KENTUCKY:—"Brutal stripes, and all the various kinds of personal indignities are not the only species of cruelty which slavery licenses. The law does not recognise the family relations of a slave, and extends to him no protection in the enjoyment of domestic endearments. The members of a slave family may be forcibly separated, so that they shall never more meet till the final judgment; and cupidity often induces the masters to practise what the law allows. Brothers and sisters, parents and children, husbands and wives are torn asunder, and permitted to see each other no more. These acts are daily occurring in the midst of us. The shrieks and the agony often witnessed on such occasions proclaim with a trumpet tongue, the INIQUITY AND CRUELTY OF OUR SYSTEM."—*Address*, 1835.

HENRY CLAY:—"I consider slavery as a curse—a curse to the master—a wrong, a grievous wrong to the slave. In the *abstract*, it is all wrong, and no possible contingency can make it right."—*Colonization Speech*, 1836.

T. MARSHALL, of Fauquier county, Virginia:—"Slavery is ruinous to the whites. The master has no capital but what is vested in HUMAN FLESH. The father, instead of being richer for his sons, is at a loss to provide for them. There is no diversity of occupations, no incentive to enterprise. *Labor of every species is disreputable*, because performed mostly by slaves. Our towns are stationary, our villages almost everywhere declining, and the general aspect of the country marks the curse of a wasteful, idle, reckless population, who have no interest in the soil, and care not how much it is impoverished."—*Speech in Virginia Legislature*, 1845.

And now, sir, what will you do with this host of witnesses, which might be indefinitely enlarged? Will you, a Northern man, charge *these* witnesses with an imperfect knowledge of slavery? By no means; but you may say of them, quite as truly as of the Bishop of Oxford, that, had they only been at Scuppernong last Good Friday and Easter Sunday, they would have "been prompted to ask instant pardon" of the American church, for having spoken so harshly of an institution which she enjoys, defends, and blesses.

Warburton, in his *Divine Legation* (vol. II., p. 92), informs us that the ancient sages held it lawful and expedient to teach one doctrine to the people at large, and an opposite one to a select number. Hence the *double doctrine* of these philosophers—the one external, intended for the public, and known as the *exoteric*; the other internal, common to friends and disciples, and denominated the *esoteric*. The slaveholders of the present day have their *double doctrine* also; and to distinguish between the *exoteric* and the *esoteric*, it is only necessary to ascertain

whether the language used is intended for effect on the north or the south side of Mason and Dixon's line. For the purpose of illustrating this double doctrine, which in the sequel will be found very useful in explaining the spiritual phenomena witnessed at Scuppernong, I will call your attention to the *exoteric* teachings of those distinguished sages, Governors Hayne and Hammond, both within a few years chief magistrates of South Carolina. The former, in his message to the Legislature, in 1833, thus speaks to the South Carolina lawgivers, but only for the purpose of being overheard by the people of the North :

"It is a remarkable fact, that even during the revolutionary war, when the State was overrun by a barbarous enemy, marching openly under the banner of emancipation, *our domestics could not be seduced from their masters*, but proved a source of STRENGTH, and not of weakness, to the country."

Governor Hayne, no doubt, adopted the maxim of the Grecian philosophers, that truth and utility do not always coincide; for he was, of course, too well informed in the history of his native State not to have been conscious that the "remarkable fact" thus officially announced was an impudent invention of his own. Let us listen to the testimony borne by history to the *fidelity* of South Carolina domestics, and the *strength* they yielded to the country during the revolutionary war :

"March 29, 1799.—The committee appointed to take into consideration the *circumstances of the Southern States*, and the ways and means for their safety and defence, report: That the State of SOUTH CAROLINA (as represented by the delegates of said State, and by Mr. Huger, who has come hither, at the request of the Governor of said State, on purpose to explain the peculiar circumstances thereof) is UNABLE to make any effectual efforts with the militia, by reason of the great proportion of citizens *necessary to remain at home to prevent insurrection among the negroes, and prevent their desertion to the enemy.*"—*Secret Journal of Congress*, vol. II., p. 105.

"The negroes *seduced* and taken from the inhabitants of SOUTH CAROLINA in the course of the war, remained subject to the disposal of the enemy. They were successively shipped to the West Indies; and it is asserted, on the authority of the best informed citizens of South Carolina, that more than TWENTY THOUSAND slaves were lost to the State in consequence of the war."—*Col. H. Lee's Memoirs of the Revolutionary War in the Southern Department*, vol. II., p. 456.

Dr. Ramsay was a native of South Carolina, and in 1809, published his History of the State, in the city of Charleston. Is it to be believed that the Governor had never heard of the following facts recorded by the historian? Speaking of the campaign of 1779, Ramsay tells us :

"The forces under the command of General Provost marched

through the richest settlements of the State, where are the fewest white inhabitants in proportion to the number of slaves. The hapless Africans allured with the hopes of freedom, *forsook their owners*, and repaired in great numbers, to the royal army. They endeavored to recommend themselves to their new masters by discovering where their owners had concealed their property, and were assisting in carrying it off."—*Vol I., p. 312.*

Describing the invasion the next year, he says:

"The slaves a *second time* flocked to the British army."—*Vol I., p. 236.*

Again: "Immediately after the surrender (of Charleston), five hundred negroes were ordered to be put on board the ships for *pioneers* to the royal forces in New York."—*Vol. I., p. 35.*

Finally: "It has been computed by good judges, that between the years 1775 and 1783 the State of South Carolina lost TWENTY-FIVE THOUSAND negroes!!"—*Vol I., p. 475.*

The census of 1790, found the whole number of slaves, men, women, and children, in South Carolina, to be only 107,000. Now if a few years before, of those physically capable of seeking refuge in the British camp and fleet, no less than twenty-five thousand availed themselves of the presence of the enemy to escape from their masters, we may form some idea of the *truth* of Governor Hayne's eulogium on the *fidelity of South Carolina slaves.*

The object of the Governor's mendacious FACT was to lead the people of the North to believe that their sympathy for the slaves was misplaced, that their suffering was "imaginary;" since, if they retained their allegiance to their masters, in the presence of a British emancipating army, they must certainly be very well contented with their condition.

In 1822, there was in Charleston a rumor of an intended servile insurrection; and this very gentleman, then Colonel Hayne, patrolled the streets one whole night, at the head of five companies of soldiers, to prevent the faithful domestics from cutting their masters' throats. No less than thirty-five "domestics" were soon after tried, convicted, and *hung*, for their *intended* insurrection; and in this judicial butchery, this same Colonel Hayne played his part as one of the judges!

The Governor did not see fit to refer to the fidelity of Southern slaves during the *more recent* war of 1812. Let us supply his omission. A memorial presented to Congress by certain Virginia and Maryland slaveholders, and to be found in the documents of the 2d Sess. 20th Cong., sets forth, that "in July and August, 1814, the enemy made several landings on the northern neck of Virginia. All the militia in this peninsula were called into service, and the *property* (slaves) was pretty well protected.



On a sudden an order came, that all the troops should be marched to the defence of Washington; and this neck of eighteen miles wide was emptied of all its efficient force for nearly six weeks. During the absence of the forces there was nothing to restrain our slaves, and they FLOCKED IN HUNDREDS TO THE ENEMY."

Governor Hammond, another South Carolina sage, addressing the North from the floor of Congress, 1st of February, 1836, taught the following *exoteric* doctrine:

"Sir, our slaves are a peaceful, kindhearted, and affectionate race, *satisfied with their lot, happy in their comforts, and devoted to their masters.* It will not be an easy thing to seduce them from their fidelity."

And now, sir, for a little *esoteric* doctrine relative to the "devotion" of slaves to their masters. Soon after the hanging of domestics by dozens in Charleston, a pamphlet appeared there, entitled "Reflections Occasioned by the Late Disturbances in Charleston," attributed to Gen. T. Pinkney. It was an essay on the dangers to be apprehended from the slave population, and the means of averting them. Of the "*house servants*" it is said:

"They are the *most dangerous*; their intimate acquaintance with all the circumstances relating to the interior of the dwellings, the confidence reposed in them, and the information they unavoidably obtain from hearing the conversation and observing the habitual transactions of their owners, afford them the most ample means for TREACHEROUS BLOODSHED AND DEVASTATION. The success, therefore, of servile conspiracies mainly depends on this class for taking off by *midnight murder* their unsuspecting owners; and the late trials, by exhibiting so large a portion of this description among the ringleaders of the conspiracy, afford a melancholy proof of their promptitude to become actors in such scenes."—Page 14.

Another pamphlet came out the same year at Charleston, said to be from the pen of Edwin C. Holland, Esq., and called "A Refutation of the Calumnies circulated against the Southern and Western States." It concluded with the following *esoteric* advice:

"Let it never be forgotten, that our negroes are truly the *Jacobins* of the country; that they are the *anarchists and the domestic enemy*; the *common enemy* of civilized society; and the *barbarians* who would, if they could, become the DESTROYERS OF OUR RACE."

"We of the South," says the Maysville (Tennessee) Intelligencer, "are emphatically surrounded by a dangerous class of beings—*degraded, stupid savages*—who, if they could but once entertain the idea that immediate and unconditional death would not be their portion, would re-enact the St. Domingo tragedy."

**Says the Southern Religious Telegraph :**

"Hatred to the whites, with the exception in some cases of attachment to the person and family of the master, is nearly universal among the black population. We have, then, a foe cherished in our own bosoms—a foe willing to draw our LIFE BLOOD whenever the opportunity is offered."

The slaveholders, when thus cautioning each other against the intense hatred felt for them by the slaves, seem never to ask themselves, "is there not a cause?"

The double doctrine is not confined to the laity; even the CLERGY occasionally condescend to use it. One of the most astonishing specimens of the clerical *exoteric* to be met with in the writings of Southern divines, is furnished by the Rev. J. C. THORNTON, President of the Centenary College, Clinton, Mississippi. This gentleman, in a volume entitled an "Inquiry into the History of Slavery, 1841," but in reality, a philippic against Abolitionists, scoffing at the alleged ignorance of the slaves, thus exclaims:

"They are so 'ignorant' that they are chiefly all in the South members of three or four denominations, Protestant Episcopalians, Presbyterians, Baptists, Methodists; among all of whom are colored ministers of exalted standing, who would honor any pulpit in America. When those who are not church members are added to the above, it will make *at least* two MILLIONS of slaves in regular attendance on divine worship."—Pp. 108—110.

To these specimens of the reverend gentleman's veracity, we add one of his refinement. Addressing, in his book, by name, two anti-slavery writers at the North, he tells them—

"Bring forward your son, out with your daughter, and either shall have an Angola negro before night."—P. 140.

As the whole number of slaves, including children, at the last census, was rather *less* than three millions, and at the least two millions of these are in regular attendance on divine worship, it must be confessed that the slaves are the greatest church-going people in the world. "Happy are the people that are in such a case." But before indulging in our pious gratulations, let us attend to the *esoteric* teaching on the subject of slave religion. In a sermon preached before an association of planters in Georgia, by the Rev. C. C. Jones, and published at Savannah, 1831, we have the following confessions:

"The description which the Apostle Paul, in his Epistle to the Romans, gives of the heathen world, will apply with very little abatement, to our negroes. They lie, blaspheme, are slothful, envious, malicious, inventors of evil things, deceivers, covenant breakers, implacable, unmerciful. Numbers of the Negroes do not go to church,

and cannot tell who Jesus Christ is, nor have they ever heard so much as the ten commandments read and explained. . . . Generally speaking, they appear to be without hope, and without God in the world—A NATION OF HEATHEN IN OUR VERY MIDST.”

The report of the Synod of South Carolina and Georgia, made 5th December, 1833, and published at Charleston, makes the following revelations :

“ Who would credit it, that in these years of revival and benevolent effort, in this Christian republic, there are OVER TWO MILLIONS of human beings in the condition of *heathen*, and in some respects in a worse condition. From long continued and close observation, we believe that their moral and religious condition is such that they may justly be considered the HEATHEN of this Christian country, and will bear a comparison with heathen in any part of the world. . . . It is universally the fact throughout the slaveholding States, that either custom or law prohibits them the acquisition of letters, and consequently they can have no access to the Scriptures. . . . In the vast field, extending from an entire State beyond the Potomac to the Sabine river, and from the Atlantic to the Ohio, there are, to the best of our knowledge, not *twelve* men exclusively devoted to the religious instruction of the negroes. As to *ministers of their own color*, they are destitute, infinitely, both in point of numbers and qualifications, to say nothing of the fact that such a ministry is looked upon with distrust, and discountenanced. But do not the negroes have access to the Gospel through the stated ministry of the whites? No. . . . We venture the assertion, that if we take the whole number of ministers in the slaveholding States, *but a very small portion pay any attention to them*. . . . The negroes have no regular and efficient ministry; as a matter of course, NO CHURCHES; neither is there sufficient room in the white churches for their accommodation. We know of but *five* churches in the slaveholding States built expressly for their use. . . . We may now enquire if they enjoy the privileges of the Gospel in private, in their own houses, or on their own plantations? Again we return a negative answer. They have NO BIBLES to read at their own firesides, they have no family altars; and, when in affliction and sickness, or death, they have no minister to address to them the consolations of the Gospel, nor to bury them with solemn and appropriate services.”

Certainly the Rev. President of “Centenary College, Clinton, Mississippi,” and the Synod of South Carolina and Georgia, differ somewhat as to the religious character of *two millions of slaves*. According to the one, they are regular attendants on divine worship; according to the other, they are “in the condition of HEATHEN.” According to the one, among the Episcopalian, Presbyterian, Baptist, and Methodist slaves, there are “*colored ministers of exalted standing, who would honor any pulpit in America.*” According to the other—“as to ministers

of their own color, they are destitute *infinitely* both in point of number and qualifications."

A writer in the Charleston Courier tells us, "There are upwards of 20,000 colored persons in Charleston and on the Neck, and there are but inadequate accommodations and opportunities for their attendance on the preaching of the Word of God, by admission to *galleries* in some of our churches; there being *many* which do not even vouchsafe them that privilege." A late writer in the Charleston Mercury, opposing a proposition to form colored congregations, remarks:

"It has been the policy of this State, not to admit the teaching to the slaves, either of reading or writing; we all know why this is so. No matter from what combination of causes, the result has been produced, in this part of the country 'for weal or for wo,' our lives and fortunes are indissolubly connected with the preservation of that institution. It needed no great scope of argument to satisfy those who framed our laws, that *the expansion of intellect*, the hundred influences which education generates, would be very inconsistent with habits of *obedience*, which was the corner stone of the institution."

Let us now apply this double doctrine to the case of the slave Christians of Scuppernong, and see whether we cannot find some *esoteric* revelations which might cause the Bishop of Oxford to pause a little before he asks pardon for his reproof of the American church.

It seems that, during Lent, you visited certain plantations "which had been without stated ministerial services for the greater part of the year." In the midst of this destitution of the means of grace, you appeared on the ground, and "commenced"—for it appears you had not time to finish—"a new course of *oral* catechetical instruction to the servants." How far the *servants* were permitted to listen to your daily lectures and services, and whether they enjoyed the *oral* instruction on other days than the Sabbath, is uncertain, since no mention is made of the suspension of labor on the plantations, except on Good Friday. However this may be, certain results are recorded. You saw masters and servants *standing side by side* in the holy services of Passion week. Probably the church in which you officiated had no *galleries*, and hence when the services required the congregation to stand, you saw the masters and slaves standing on the *same floor*. Had you seen them *sitting together* in the same pews, we could better have understood their position, and should have shared your surprise. On Good Friday all secular labor was suspended. This, of course, was not the effect of the *oral* instruction to the servants, but an act of civility on the part of the masters to the Bishop, who had

made the visit by particular request. On this day, you saw the "cleanly clad multitude thronging the house of prayer, to pay homage to a crucified Savior." It was far easier to see a large gang of slaves standing in the church, than to see the motive which brought them there. It is not to be supposed that, during the Bishop's visit, the slaves were told to throw down their hoes, and put on clean clothes, merely to spend Good Friday in dancing, or roaming over the plantations. Whatever may have been the piety of the "multitude," they were most unquestionably *ordered* to go to church, and a sound flogging would have been the fate of every truant. On the blessed Easter morn you beheld "the master with his *goodly* number of servants kneeling with reverent hearts and devout thanksgivings, to take the bread of life at the *same* altar." As no Protestant Episcopal church has as yet more than *one* altar or communion table, the communicants, as a matter of course, knelt at the same. As the service was performed by you, it was of course performed with rubrical correctness; and, not being interrupted with narratives of personal experiences and feelings, it is not very obvious how you made the discovery that the *goodly number of servants* knelt with reverent hearts and devout thanksgivings.

You flatter yourself, sir, that if these sights had been witnessed by some of "our brethren from other lands" (probably Northern and English Abolitionists), they would have changed their note of wailing over *imaginary* suffering into the jubilant chant, "Happy are the people that are in such a case; yea, blessed are the people who have the Lord for their God!!" Be assured, sir, that unless they very *imperfectly understood* the subject, no such exclamations would be prompted by their hearts nor escape from their lips. They would not regard as happy the masters who compelled a goodly number of their fellow Christians to toil for them without wages; and the more easily to keep them in subjection, prevented the *expansion of their intellect*, and denied them the common rights of humanity, and particularly that of searching the Scriptures. They would not regard the *multitude* of slaves happy, because excused from labor on Good Friday, while toiling under the lash every other week day in the year; nor, finally, would they pronounce masters and slaves happy, merely because they were seen to receive the communion on Easter Sunday.

Most true it is, that he who has the Lord for his God is blessed, whether he bleeds under the lash of the slave driver, or expires a martyr at the stake; and equally true is it, that his blessedness affords no justification to his brother for treating

him as a beast of burden, or offering his life a sacrifice to religious intolerance. No Christian will deny the power of the Holy Spirit to penetrate the gloomy prison house of Southern bondage, and to enlighten, sanctify, and save its miserable inmates. But the blessings of Grace, as of Providence, are ordinarily bestowed in return for the use of appointed means ; and where those means are withheld, or partially applied, or grossly perverted, other evidence may justly be required, that the slave has made the Lord his God, than the simple fact that he is seen to receive the communion in his master's church, and in his company. It is somewhat questionable whether your spirit would have been equally refreshed at the sight of a multitude of Presbyterian, Baptist, or Methodist slaves, receiving the communion from the hands of a minister destitute of Episcopal ordination ; or whether you would have been equally assured of *their* blessedness. Yet you well know, sir, that in the choice of their church and creed the slaves are for the most part passive ; and that, had the Scuppernong communicants been sent to auction on Easter Monday, they would each thenceforth have worshipped in the place and manner directed by "the highest bidder."

The Southern churches number their slave communicants by thousands ; but profession is not principle ; and in all ages and countries, there has ever been a ready conformity to the religion of the ruling despot. Where the slave makes no religious profession, the cause is for the most part to be found in the indifference of the master.

The *esoteric* teaching on this subject is not calculated to inspire very strong confidence in slave piety. In an account of the "Intended Insurrection," published by the authorities of Charleston, 1822, it is stated, that of those executed several had been "class-leaders." "Jack Green was a preacher ; Billy Palmer exceedingly pious, and a communicant of the church of his master ; Jack Purcell, no less devout." The ensuing year, the Rev. Dr. Dalcho, assistant minister of St. Michael's church, Charleston, published a pamphlet in vindication of slavery, but had the decency to omit his name on the title-page.\* Alluding to the late conspirators, he says :

"I write with feelings of the deepest regret, that some of the conspirators were preachers, class-leaders, and communicants ; thus *verifying* the truth of a remark which teachers have too often occasion to make, that THERE IS LITTLE CONFIDENCE TO BE PLACED IN THE RELIGIOUS PROFESSIONS OF NEGROES. I speak generally. Much ani-

---

\* Practical Considerations, founded on the Scriptures, relative to the Slave Population of South Carolina. By a South Carolinian.

mal excitement may be, and oftentimes is, produced, where but little real devotion is felt in the heart. I sympathize most sincerely with the very respectable and pious clergyman, whose heart must still bleed at the recollection that his confidential class-leader, but a week or two before his just conviction, had received the communion of the Lord's Supper from his hand. This *wretch* had been brought up in his pastor's family, and was treated with the same Christian attention as was shown to their children."\*

Says the venerable and Rev. Dr. Nelson, a native of Tennessee, and formerly President of Marion College, Missouri:

"The concentrated recollection of *thirty years* furnishes me with *three* instances only, where I could say I have reason, from the known walk of that slave, to believe him or her a sincere Christian."

The Rev. C. C. Jones, probably better acquainted with the religious character of the slaves than any other Southern minister, says, in his sermon already quoted:

"Of THE PROFESSORS OF RELIGION among them, there are many of questionable piety, who occasion the different churches great trouble in discipline, for they are extremely ignorant, and frequently are guilty of the *grossest vices*."

After such facts and confessions, you cannot, sir, be surprised, should your brethren from other lands be a little sceptical about the "reverent hearts and devout thanksgivings" of the goodly number of the Scuppernong negroes. But, alas! sir, there are indeed far weightier reasons than these facts and confessions, to justify such scepticism.

The *very peculiar character* of that Christianity which is offered to the slaves is well calculated to insure its rejection by them. Love is the great motive, argument, and command of the Gospel. God is love. God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son. We love God, because he first loved us. Love one another, so shall all men know that ye are my disciples. One is your Father, which is in heaven; all ye are brethren. When *we* are cruelly and unjustly treated, we know that we suffer in violation of the precepts of our religion, and we are taught to pray for the offender, that his sin may be forgiven. Far different is the religion offered to the slave. He is instructed that the common Father of All has authorized a portion of his children to convert the others into articles of merchandise. The favored children, moreover, are permitted to withhold from their brethren the revelation made by their Heavenly Father, and which he has declared is able to make them wise unto salvation. The slave also learns, by experience,

---

\* But the wretch was the *slave* of his pastor.

that to him is denied the marriage and the parental relations—blessed boons, expressly conferred by God upon others. While this religion calls on some to be diligent in business, that they may provide for their families, he is informed that this same religion requires from him unceasing and unrepining toil, for the sole benefit of his happier brethren. A future life is indeed revealed to him, and he is promised happiness in *another* world, on certain conditions; among which are, always, *obedience* to his master, and refusal to *escape* from bondage. The slave is taught that those privations and sufferings which he endures, and which outrage his moral sense, are in perfect accordance with the precepts of his religion; and that to pray for the *forgiveness* of his oppressor would be but to insult that Divine Majesty which clothed the oppressor with power, and authorized him to use it in crushing his weaker brother.

Such is the Christianity presented to the slave—a religion which his own consciousness must tell him is partial, severe, and unjust, nullifying in the case of the *black* man the holy and benevolent precepts it gives to his *white* brother, and sanctifying a system of cruelty and oppression, which every faculty of his soul tells him is wrong.

And by whom is this species of Christianity received, beyond the slave region? Almost the whole of Christendom rejects it as spurious. The wise and good of all countries abhor it. The bishops of the Church of England denounce it. Not a bishop at home, in a free State, dare give it his sanction. And yet it is supposed that the poor *slave*, who of all others has the most reason to reject a religion which sinks him below humanity, will cordially embrace it!

Not only is this religion necessarily repugnant to the natural moral sense of the slaves, but the very persons who preach it must be objects of their distrust and aversion. No minister addresses the slaves on a plantation, but by *permission* of the master; nor is any slave ordinarily admitted to Christian ordinances, but by the same permission, expressed or implied. Hence the minister virtually addresses the slave as the agent of his master, and, instead of letting the slave perceive that he sympathizes in his sufferings, and laments and condemns his oppression, he labors to impress him with the belief that God Almighty sanctions the servitude beneath which he groans, and requires from him a ready submission to it. Is it in human nature that *such* shepherds should be loved by the flock?

No clergyman at the South has probably labored more zealously in behalf of the spiritual interests of the slaves than the



Rev. C. C. Jones ; but, unhappily, he has labored as the agent of the masters and the supporter of human bondage ; and what has been his success ? Listen to his story, as related in the Tenth Report of the Association for the Religious Instruction of the Negroes in Liberty county, Georgia :

"I was preaching," says he, "to a large congregation, on the Epistle to Philemon : and when I insisted on *fidelity and obedience* as Christian virtues in servants, and upon the authority of Paul, **CONDEMNED THE PRACTICE OF RUNNING AWAY**, *one half of my audience deliberately rose up and walked off with themselves* ; and those who remained looked anything but satisfied with the preacher or his doctrine. After dismissal, there was no small stir among them ; some solemnly declared that there was no such Epistle in the Bible : others, that it was not the Gospel ; others, that *I preached to please the masters* ; others, that they did not care if they never heard me preach again."—P. 24

Had Mr. Jones been untrammelled by the theory of slavery and the interests of the masters, he would have preached a very different sermon, and experienced very different treatment. After reading the Epistle, he would have told his audience that the text left it wholly uncertain whether Onesimus was a slave or a hired servant ; that, in either case, the Apostle had no power to compel him to return to his master ; and that, of course, his return was wholly voluntary ; that, so far from being in disgrace, or liable to arrest on his journey, he was sent by the Apostle as "a faithful and beloved brother," a messenger to a Christian church (Col. iv. 9) ; that, if he was in fact a slave, then the Apostle demanded his immediate emancipation, by requiring his master to receive him, "not now *as a slave*, but above a slave, a brother beloved." The preacher might then have pressed upon his hearers, from the injunctions of the Apostle, the duties of forgiveness and kindness. Such a sermon would have recommended Christianity to the slaves, and exposed the preacher to be lynched by the masters.

In 1792-'93, a number of American citizens were held as slaves in Algiers, and by as valid and sacred a title as that by which any slave is held in North Carolina. Indeed, these American slaves were held by precisely the same title, the fortune of war, as were a great portion of the Roman slaves, whose bondage you and Bishop Freeman insist was approved by Christ and his Apostles. These slaves, 105 in number, in a petition to Congress, declared : "We are employed daily at the most laborious work, without respect of persons, and shut up at night in two *slave prisons*." What would have been the feelings of these slaves towards an English clergyman, in the pay of the Dey, who, with his permission, should have preached to them

from the Epistle to Philemon, urging upon them fidelity and obedience to their Algerine masters as Christian duties, and assuring them, on the authority of St. Paul, of the great sin they would commit in attempting to escape from their "slave prisons?"

Mr. Jones has prepared a catechism for the slaves. In this manual of religious instruction, they are asked, "Is it right for the servant to run away; or is it right to harbor a runaway?" To this question, the slaves are required to respond an emphatic "NO."

Is there a slave, is there a white man, who believes that the Rev. C. C. Jones, if, through some misfortune or violence, he should be reduced to bondage in Russia or Turkey, would not, in spite of his catechism, embrace the first favorable opportunity "to run away;" or, if he could not run away himself, that he would be restrained by scruples of conscience from *harboring* a fellow-countryman, who had partially succeeded in making his escape? Yet the wretched slaves are required by their religious teachers to believe that God requires them to remain voluntarily in a state of ignorance and degradation, and even to refuse their aid to their wives, children, and friends, who are endeavoring to recover their liberty! Such a doctrine is alone sufficient to give the negroes a disgust to the religion of which they are assured it forms a part. And now let me ask, Who believes or acknowledges this doctrine, beyond the slave region? Is there a minister of Christ, except among the slaveholders, who would so far expose his sacred character to public abhorrence, as to betray a fugitive slave to the kidnappers? Who thinks it a sin at the North or in Europe to harbor a runaway? Who, at the North, except here and there a needy attorney, policeman, or a merchant ready to barter his character for Southern custom, is vile enough to carry into practice the doctrine of Mr. Jones's negro catechism, and bewray him that wandereth, or refuse to hide the outcasts, or to be a covert to them from the face of the spoiler?

Not only is Christianity presented to the slaves by its ministers in an odious and disgusting form, but these very ministers are perceived by the slaves to be the agents of the masters, and to preach to "*please them*," and are themselves almost universally *owners of human beings*, buying and selling men, women, and children. Is it possible that such men can be honored, and trusted, and beloved by the slaves, as their spiritual teachers, friends and guides?

But, alas! Christianity is rendered still more repulsive to the slave by the fact that not only do its teachers make merchan-

dise of their brethren in Christ, but that organized churches are not unfrequently

“Christian brokers in the trade of blood,”

appropriating the profits of the traffic to the support of the priest and the temple!

A fugitive slave told his friends at the North that he had ceased receiving the Lord's Supper in the church to which he had been attached, because the CHURCH had sold his brother to pay for their communion plate; and “I could not bear,” said he, “to go forward and receive the communion from vessels which were the purchase of my brother's blood.”

We have no *proof* of the truth of this anecdote, but we have most abundant evidence of its credibility. Says the Rev. J. Cable, in a printed letter of 20th March, 1846:

“I have lived eight years in a slave State (Virginia), and received theological education at the Union Theological Seminary near Hampden Sydney College. Those who know anything about slavery, know the worst kind is *jobbing slavery*—that is, hiring out slaves from year to year, while the master is not present to protect them. It is the interest of the one who hires them to get the worth of his money out of them, and the loss is the master's, if they die. What shocked me more than anything else, was the CHURCH engaging in this jobbing of slaves. The college church which I attended, held slaves enough to pay the pastor, Mr. Stanton, one thousand dollars a year; of which the church members, as I understood, did not pay a cent. The slaves who had been *left to the church* by some pious mother in Israel, had increased so as to be a large and increasing fund. These were hired out on Christmas day of each year—the day on which they celebrate the birth of our Savior—to the highest bidder. These worked hard the whole year to pay the pastor \$1,000, and it was left to the caprice of the employers whether they ever heard one sermon. Since the Abolitionists have made so much noise about the connexion of the church with slavery, the Rev. Elisha Balenter informed me the church has sold this property, and put the money into other stock. There were *four* churches near the college that supported the pastor, in whole or in part, in the same way, viz.: Cumberland church, John Kirk, pastor; Briney church, Wm. Plummer, pastor (since Dr. P., of Richmond); Buffalo church, Mr. Cochran, pastor; Pisgah church, near the Peaks of Otter, J. Mitchell, pastor.”

The Rev. Mr. Paxton, a Virginian, and once a slaveholder, states, in his “Letters on Slavery,” that the church in Virginia, of which he was pastor, owned SEVENTY SLAVES, and that his salary was chiefly derived from the hire of their labor.

In 1832, Mrs. Ann Pray, of Georgia, left a legacy of certain slaves to the American Missionary Board of Commissioners—a legacy very properly declined by the Board.

“A prime gang of ten negroes, accustomed to the culture of

otton and provisions, belonging to the *Independent Church*, in Christ Church parish," was advertised for sale in the Charleston Courier of 12th February, 1835.

In the Savannah Republican, 23d March, 1845, C. O'Neal, sheriff, advertised eight slaves for sale for cash, to satisfy a mortgage in favor of "*The Board of Directors of the Theological Seminary of the Synod of South Carolina and Georgia.*"

So it seems the Seminary loans its money on the security of a certain amount of human flesh, and this under the direction of the very Synod whose report "on the religious instruction of the colored population" we have already quoted. Deeply are these pious Christians exercised in their minds about the *heathenism* of their brethren whom they are selling for cash, to educate young gentlemen for the ministry!

The "Spirit of Missions" some time since informed its readers, that "the Bishop of Georgia, in his Montpelier Institution, is testing the sufficiency of SLAVE LABOR to support it." It is to be hoped Bishop Elliott will before long favor the public with the result of his interesting and very Christian experiment.

In the Southern church, moreover, the desire for the salvation of the negroes is in entire subserviency to the supposed interests of the masters. The New Orleans Picayune of 16th August, 1841, has the following:

"Chauncey B. Black was brought before Recorder Baldwin, charged with tampering with slaves. It was proved that he was seen conversing with a number of them in the street; that he asked them if they could read and write, and if they would like a Bible. This was the amount of the testimony against him. *In palliation of his conduct*, it was shown that he was regularly appointed agent of the Bible Society in New Orleans, to distribute the Bible to such as would accept of it. The society, however, disclaimed *having the most distant intention of giving the Scriptures to slaves*; and it was said Black had exceeded his commission in offering it. But as it appeared to be a misunderstanding on his part, and not intentional interference with the peculiar institution, he was discharged with a *caution not to repeat his offence.*"

Now hear the New Orleans Presbytery, in their Report of 1846:

"There are within the bounds of the presbytery at least 100,000 colored persons, most of whom are slaves. It is a lamentable fact, that by far the greater part are *famishing and perishing for the bread of life.*"

With what ineffable scorn must the slaves regard such lamentations over their famine for the bread of life, from the lips of

men who have not the most distant intention of giving the Scriptures to slaves?

The Southern Religious Telegraph had opened its columns to a series of papers in behalf of christianizing the slaves. Some of the Virginians became alarmed, and forthwith the obsequious editor announces:

"At the suggestion of some of our fellow citizens, who regard the discussion of the religious instruction of slaves *inexpedient* at this time, we *cheerfully* comply with their wishes, and will discontinue for the present the publication of articles on the subject."

Says the Georgia Conference Missionary Society, in its Report for 1838:

"Our Missions among the *whites* have shared in this season of refreshing from the presence of the Lord. The missions to the slaves have not been distinguished by so great a multiplication of church members, chiefly because the mode of operation is *essentially* different. It is deemed *imprudent* to foster among the colored people those great excitements which minister so powerfully to the building up our societies among the whites."

Here we have an avowal, that, from prudential reasons—that is, from regard to the security of slave property—the slaves have been deprived by these Methodist missionaries of certain auxiliaries, supposed to be highly conducive to salvation.

In 1835, the slaveholders of Charleston, having sacked the post office, and riotously destroyed some anti-slavery papers found in it, called a public meeting, for the avowed purpose of controlling the freedom of the mail. The Charleston Courier, giving the particulars of the meeting, announced that

"The CLERGY of all denominations attended in a body, lending *their sanction* to the proceedings, and adding by their presence to the impressive character of the scene."

The sacrifice of decency in attending this lawless meeting, was not the only one which the Charleston clergy offered on the altar of slavery. The slave-holders resolved:

"That the thanks of this meeting are due to the reverend gentlemen of the clergy in this city who have so *promptly* and so *effectually* responded to the public sentiment, by suspending their schools, in which the *free colored population* were taught; and that this meeting deem it a patriotic action, worthy of all praise, and proper to be imitated by the teachers of similar schools throughout the State."

It is quite in character, that the Charleston slave-holders should deem it a *patriotic* act in the ministers of the Lord Jesus Christ to drive *black* children from their Sunday schools; but what judgment will be formed of these pusillanimous clergymen

by Him who has commanded his servants not to fear what *man* can do unto them? Most truly, says the Bishop of Oxford:

"It is a time for martyrdom, and the American church has scarcely produced a single confessor."

There is still another to be added to the formidable obstacles already enumerated, to the conversion of the slaves. Their very position compels them to live in constant violation of many of the imperative obligations of Christianity.

The slave is a participator of that humanity with which the Savior clothed himself at his incarnation. As a MAN, therefore, he is placed by God in various relations, imposing corresponding duties; as a son, he is bound to honor his parents; as a brother, to love his kindred, and relieve their distresses; as a husband, to cleave to his wife till parted by death; as a father, to provide for the sustenance and education of his offspring. But the law of the land has nullified that of God, and insulates the slave from all the relations of humanity, and abrogates the obligations resulting from them. Yet the Southern priesthood, in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ, give their sanction to this law, reducing to CHATTELS the very beings for whom He died. Well, indeed, has a foreign author remarked:

"Whatever may have been the unutterable wickedness of slavery in the West India Islands, there it never was baptized in the Redeemer's hallowed name, and its corruptions were not concealed in the garb of religion. That acme of piratical turpitude was reserved for the professed disciples of Jesus in America."

You flatter yourself, sir, that, could the Bishop of Oxford have witnessed the services at Scuppernong which you have described, his views of American slavery would have undergone such a total change, that he would have asked instant pardon of the American church, for rebuking her subserviency to this terrific institution. Having said nothing of the church that was not literally true, and substantiated by most abundant proof, the Bishop could have had no motive or excuse for asking pardon. So far from having his abhorrence of slavery *diminished* by the scenes on which you dwell with so much complacency, he would have found in them new proofs of the degeneracy of the church, and of the corrupting influence of human bondage.

With what indignation would your good brother have witnessed the masters bringing their fellow-men to the house of prayer, kneeling with them at the Lord's table, partaking with them of the emblems of the Savior's body and blood, the next day driving them to the field as the ox to the furrow, and perhaps the day after tearing them from their wives and children,

and selling them to the dealer in human flesh, to be conveyed to distant markets?

Think you, sir, the Bishop would have felt very penitent for his condemnation of slavery, had he, on leaving Scuppernong, repaired to Wilmington, still in your *diocese*, and there recognised some of the Easter Sunday communicants among the *manacled passengers* described in the following letter?

“As I went on board the steamboat at Wilmington, I noticed eight colored men, *handcuffed and chained together in pairs*, four women, and eight or ten children—all standing together in the bow of the boat, in charge of a man standing near them. Coming near them, I perceived they were all greatly agitated, and, on inquiring, I found that they were all slaves who had been born and raised in *North Carolina*, and had just been sold to a speculator, who was now taking them to the *Charleston market*. Upon the shore was a number of colored persons, women and children, waiting the departure of the boat. My attention was particularly arrested by two colored females, who stood together a little distance from the crowd, and upon whose countenances was depicted the keenest sorrow. As the last bell was tolling, I saw the tears gushing from their eyes—they were the wives of two of the men in chains. There, too, were mothers and sisters, weeping at the departure of their sons and brothers; and there, too, were fathers, *taking the last look of their wives and children*. My eye now turned to those in the boat, and, although I had tried to control my feelings amidst my sympathy for those on shore, I could conceal them no more, and found myself literally weeping with those that wept. I stood near them, when one of the husbands saw his wife on the shore wave her hand for the last time; his manly efforts to restrain his feelings gave way, and, fixing his watery eyes upon her, he exclaimed, ‘This is the most distressing thing of all—my dear wife and children, farewell!’ Of the poor women on board, *three of them had husbands whom they left behind*. Sailing down Cape Fear River twenty-five miles we touched at the little village of Smithport, on the South side of the river. It was at this place that one of the slaves lived, and here were his *wife and five children*. While at work on Monday last, his purchaser took him away from his family, carried him *in chains* to Wilmington, where he remained *in jail*. As we approached the wharf, a flood of tears burst from his eyes. The boat stopped but a moment, and, as she left, he espied his wife on the stoop of a house some rods from the shore, and with one hand, which was not in the handcuff, he pulled off his old hat, and, waving it towards her, he exclaimed, ‘Farewell!’ After a few moments silence, conflicting passions seemed to tear open his breast, and he exclaimed, ‘What have I done, that I should suffer this? Oh! my wife and children—I want to live no longer!’”—*Christian Advocate and Journal*.

And is this most accursed traffic in the sheep of *your* flock an “imaginary suffering?”

Not contented with lauding the blessedness of Southern slavery, you proceed to taunt Great Britain with her factory

system, and to sneer at your brethren of the mother church for riveting such a system on their land. A vast amount of sympathy is constantly expended by the dealers in human flesh on the English poor; and he who, without compunction, sends a mother to market, or plows her back with the lash, finds his bowels of compassion yearning over the "cruel oppressions" of a factory child on the other side of the Atlantic!

It was the declaration of the Almighty, in reference to his own peculiar people, "the poor shall never cease out of the land"—a prediction virtually repeated by our Savior, and as literally fulfilled in regard to every other land as it was in Palestine. No system of government, no form of religion, has ever caused the poor to cease out of the land. Much poverty, no doubt, springs from bad government and wicked wars; but a far larger portion from the vice, improvidence, indolence, and misfortune, incident to humanity. Owing to the corruption of our nature, poverty often invites oppression, which no Government, however paternal, can prevent. In our own land, we have armies of paupers, exclusive of nearly three millions of our fellow countrymen, who are reduced by law to absolute penury. Yet this is the country, above all others, in which extent of territory, cheapness of land and demand for labor should secure, if possible, a competency for all. Is it, then, sir, a matter of surprise, that poverty should abound in England, where a population, nearly equal to that of the whole United States, is crowded into a space less than your own diocese? Owing to British industry and enterprise, the wages of labor are *higher in England* than in any other part of Europe; and, owing to the freedom of the press and of the Government, the *English* poor are probably the least oppressed of any in the Eastern World. And yet, of all the paupers of Europe, Asia and Africa, it is only over those of England that the slaveholders raise "the note of wailing."

As you thought proper to taunt the Bishop of Oxford with "the cruel oppressions of the factory system," it might have been expected that you would *specify* the oppressions to which you refer, that it might be seen whether, like the abominations of North Carolina slavery, they were authorized *by law*, and sanctioned by Bishops, or proceeded solely from the cupidity and cruelty of individuals.

It is also to be wished that you had condescended to contrast the English and American factory systems, that we might know wherein they differ. Such a comparison would not probably result as much to our credit as you suppose. The two systems differ—first, in the rate of wages, arising from the dif-



ference in the demand and supply of labor in the two countries ; and, secondly, in the paternal solicitude of the British Parliament to protect juvenile operatives from the avarice of their employers, and in the utter indifference of our republican legislatures on the subject. You speak of English churchmen helping to rivet the factory system on their land. It is to be regretted, sir, that you deal so largely in generalities, and are so averse to particular statements. How and when have English churchmen riveted the factory system on their land ? Has any presbyter of the established church lauded it as a divine institution, and received a mitre in return, through the influence of the cotton spinners ? Has any bishop, in a charge to his clergy, attempted to vindicate the system against the reproaches of the Americans, by pronouncing the sufferings of the operatives "imaginary ;" or has he represented a cotton mill as a little heaven upon earth, because labor was suspended in it on Good Friday, and because some of the hands partook of the sacrament on Easter Sunday ?

It is true the English bishops, as members of the House of Lords, have participated in the enactment of laws relating to factories. How far *such* laws authorize the "cruel oppressions" to which you refer, you do not tell us ; but something of their character may be learned from the following official notice :

"As all the clauses of the Factories Regulation Act being now in full operation, the inspectors of factories deem it expedient, in order to remove any doubts as to the employment of children subject to restricted hours of labor, to issue the following Notice :

"1. No child under nine years of age can be employed in any cotton, flax, or wool factory.

"2. No child between nine and thirteen years of age can be employed or even allowed to remain in such factory, without the certificate of a physician or surgeon, countersigned by a magistrate or an inspector of factories, certifying, in the form set forth in the 13th section, the strength and appearance of such child.

"3. No child between nine and thirteen years of age can be employed in such factory, without producing weekly a schoolmaster's certificate, that the child has, for two hours at least, for six out of seven days of the week next preceding, attended his school, excepting in cases of sickness, to be certified in such manner as such inspector may appoint ; and in case of any holiday, and in case of absence from any other cause allowed by such inspector, or by any justice of the peace in the absence of the inspector.

"4. No child between nine and thirteen years of age can be employed or even allowed to remain in such factory longer than forty eight hours in any one week, and not more than nine hours in any one day.

"5. No child under thirteen years of age can be employed in any silk mill more than ten hours in one day.

"The above, and all other provisions of the Factories Regulation Act, together with all orders and regulations issued by the inspectors, in their several districts, under the authority of this act, must be strictly observed, in the mills and factories subject to the said act.

LEONARD HORIER.

THOMAS JONES HOWARD.

ROBERT S. SAUNDERS.

*Inspectors of Factories.*

"WHITEHALL, JUNE 22, 1836.

It was, sir, exceedingly imprudent to provoke a comparison between the oppressions of the slave and the factory systems. The oppressions of a system are of course such as the system authorizes. What is the power, sir, which the slave system authorizes you to exert over your slaves? Chief Justice Henderson, of your own diocese, thus summarily answers the question: "The master has an almost absolute control over the body and mind of his slave. The master's will is the slave's will."\* This, surely, sir, is pretty ample authority to be confided even to a Christian Bishop. But let us descend to particulars, and pursue the comparison which you have so rashly introduced—let us contrast the powers vested in you, by the laws of North Carolina, over your slave, with the powers over his operative vested by act of Parliament in the English manufacturer.

1. You may with legal impunity offer your unoffending slave, whether male or female, any insult or outrage, however gross, not extending to life or limb.

The manufacturer is as responsible in law for an outrage committed on his operative, as on any other person.

2. You are restricted by law, under a penalty of two hundred dollars, from teaching your slave to read.—*Statutes of North Carolina, 1830.*

The manufacturer is allowed by law to give his operatives any instruction they may please to receive; but he can employ no child under thirteen years of age who has not at least two hours schooling a day for six days in the week.

3. You may flog your slave at pleasure, with or without cause; and if, instead of standing still under your lash, when ordered to do so, he retreats from you, you are authorized by a solemn judicial decision, made in your diocese, to take up your gun and shoot him.†

The manufacturer, for shooting his operative under similar circumstances, would be convicted of murder, and undoubtedly hung.

---

\* 2 Devereaux's North Carolina Reports, 543.

† Case of the State vs. Man, 1 Dev. Rep., p. 263, N. Carolina, 1829.

4. You are permitted by law (Haywood's Manual, 525), to keep your slave on *one quart of corn per day*.

*The manufacturer* feeds his operative by contract, or the latter provides his own food.

5. You are authorized to prevent your slave from receiving any religious instruction, and you may also compel him to receive just such as you please.

*The manufacturer* can exercise no legal authority over the conscience of his operative.

6. You may forbid your slave from seeing his wife and children, and may send him to market where and when you think proper.

*The manufacturer* has no similar privileges

7. You may, at your own will and pleasure, torment your slave by scourging, by imprisonment, by clipping his ears, by branding him with a hot iron, by fastening an iron collar about his neck, and by the various modes which malignity may devise.

*The manufacturer* is responsible to his operative, as well as to public justice, for any personal injury he may inflict on him.

8. You are at liberty, if your slave runs away, to pursue him with bloodhounds; and should he be torn by the brutes, you would be guiltless—under the slave code.

*The manufacturer*, by similar conduct, would subject himself to severe punishment.

9. You are authorized by law, if your slave absconds, and you do not know where to find him, to gratify your vengeance against him by offering, in the public papers, a reward for his MURDER.

*The manufacturer*, for such an offer in regard to his operative, would be regarded and punished as a villain.

10. You may compel your slave to toil for you from youth till old age, without other compensation than such food and raiment and shelter as may be requisite to enable him to labor.

*The manufacturer* can obtain the services of no operative except by contract; and the wages, whether more or less, are such as the latter consents to accept.

11. You are the legal proprietor of every shred of property acquired by your slave, by his own industry, by gift, by devise, or by accident. If he picks up a sixpence in the street, it is YOURS.

*The manufacturer* has no claim on his operative, except for the labor he has agreed to render for a certain compensation.

12. The children of *your* female slave are your property, and you may work, flog, or sell them, at will.

*The manufacturer* has no authority over the children of his

operative, except by contract with the parent, and in accordance with the requirements of an act of Parliament.

13. You may compel your slave to toil as many hours in the four-and-twenty, as his physical strength may enable him.\*

*The manufacturer* is restrained by act of Parliament, from exacting more than *ten* hours labor, for a day's work.

Verily, sir, the North Carolina Bishop's little finger is thicker than the Englishman's loins.† But, of course, you only vindicate slavery in the abstract, not its *abuses*. Please to recollect,

\* The Law of South Carolina is more considerate; it allows the master to compel his slave to work *only* FIFTEEN hours a day in the summer, and FOURTEEN in winter. 2 *Brevard's Digest*, 243.

† Whole sheets, nay, a volume might be filled with illustrations of the Bishop's legal prerogatives. But it is unnecessary to cumber the page with proofs of what he will not deny. He will not be rash enough to challenge the writer for proofs of the alleged atrocities of the slave laws. To prevent, however, a captious objection, it may be well to state, that, *strictly*, a North Carolina slave-holder has not a legal right to offer a reward for the murder of his slave, unless he is previously outlawed, which he may be by two justices, if he runs away, conceals himself, and, to maintain life, kills a hog, or any animal of the cattle kind.—*Haywood's Manual*, p. 521.

In point of *fact*, it is believed these rewards are generally offered without an outlawry; nor is there the least reason to believe that the omission of this formality, in killing a slave, would, in North Carolina, attract any legal animadversion. We give a few advertisements, from a great mass selected from southern papers, for the purpose of showing the putrid state of public opinion in the slave States. These advertisements are revelations of unconscious villany; and their voluntary publication in the journals of the day indicates that the atrocities they disclose are regarded by the community as in accordance with common usage and conventional propriety.

J. P. Ashford, in the Natchez Courier of 21st August, 1838.—“Run away, a negro girl, called Mary; has a small scar over her eye; a good many teeth missing. The letter A is branded on her cheek and forehead.”

M. Ricks, in the Raleigh standard (N. C.), 18th July, 1838.—“Ran away a negro woman and two children. A few days before she went off, I burnt her with a hot iron, on the left side of her face. I tried to make the letter M.

A. Ross, in “Charleston (S. C.) Courier,” of 1825.—“Ran away, a negro girl, sixteen or seventeen years of age. Lately branded on the left cheek thus—R, and a piece taken out of her ear on the same side. The same letter on the inside of her legs.”

T. Engry, in the New Orleans Bee, of 27th October, 1837.—“Ran away, negress Caroline; had on a collar with one prong turned down.”

J. Henderson in the Grand Gulf (Miss.) Advertiser, of 20th August, 1838.—“Ran away, a black woman, Betsey; had an iron bar on her right leg.”

J. Maccin, in the New Orleans Bee, 11th August 1838.—“Ran away, the negress Fanny; had on an iron band about her neck.”

T. J. De Tampert, in the Mobile Chronicle, June 15, 1838.—“Ran away, a negro boy, about twelve years old; had round his neck a chain dog collar, with De Tampert engraven on it.”

Peter Campbell, in the Charleston Courier, February 26, 1836, after describing two runaways, adds, “Two hundred dollars will be given for Billy, and one hundred dollars for Pompey, if lodged in jail; or fifty dollars for BILLY'S HEAD.”

W. D. Cobb, in the Newbern (N. C.) Spectator, 2d December, 1836.—“I will give the reward of one hundred dollars for the above negroes, to be delivered to me, or confined in the jail of Lenoir or Jones county, or for killing them so that I can see them.”

Durant H. Rhodes, in the Wilmington (N. C.) Advertiser, 13th July, 1838. “Ran away, my negro man, Richard. A reward of twenty-five dollars will be given for his apprehension dead or alive. Satisfactory proof will only be required of his being KILLED.”

Enoch Foy, in the Newbern (N. C.) Spectator, 5th January, 1838.—“Ran away, a negro man, Sampson. Should he resist, in being taken, so that violence is necessary to arrest him, I will not hold any person liable for damages should the slave be killed.”

J McDonald, in the Apalachicola Gazette, 6th May, 1841, advertises three runaway slaves, and offers one hundred and fifty dollars “to any one who will KILL THE THREE, or fifty for either one.”

sir, that you have given your episcopal sanction to "SLAVERY AS IT EXISTS AT THE PRESENT DAY." This, in its most limited sense, means slavery as at present *established by law*. And now, sir, will you please to tell us what *are* the *abuses* of a legal system which takes away an innocent man's liberty, renders him a piece of animated merchandise, deprives him of all volition, places him entirely at your will, denies him all the fruits of his labor, divests him of the character of a son, a husband, and a father, and utterly debars him from the pursuit of his own happiness? If in all this there is none other than "imaginary suffering," do let us know what you consider the "cruel oppressions of the factory system."

Most dangerous, odious, and corrupting, would be your power over your slave, even were it intrusted to none other but a RIGHT REVEREND FATHER IN GOD; but, alas! the power you possess is, in your diocese, a vendible commodity; and any vile, brutal infidel may, for a little money, or by virtue of a gift or devise, acquire the same tremendous legal prerogatives over his slave, as are enjoyed by yourself.

If slavery be indeed an institution so evidently enjoying the Divine sanction, that it is presumption to pronounce it *wrong*, it must be a good institution, and Christian benevolence must ~~require us~~ to labor for its extension. This duty is indeed zealously discharged at present by our Southern brethren, but under the *exoteric* plea of "extending the area of human freedom." But why mask with a lie a work of love and mercy, which God approves?

There are considerations connected with the efforts of the Southern clergy to sustain slavery, which they would do well to ponder. If the condition of the slave be, as most of them confess it is, generally unfavorable to religious faith and personal holiness, then there is danger that, at the great day of account, the blood of souls will be found on the skirts of those who have striven to justify and to perpetuate that condition.

Every man, without exception, when he makes the case *his own*, and examines it solely by the light of nature, pronounces slavery a sin and a curse. Now, it is very possible that many who may be convinced, by the labors of yourself and others, that slavery is sanctioned by the Gospel, may also arrive at the conclusion that a religion, thus outraging the moral sense implanted in the human heart by the Creator, cannot proceed from Him.\*

---

\* Said Mr. Fries, on the floor of Congress, in reference to a southern member who had attempted a biblical vindication of slavery: "I wish it to be distinctly understood by my constituents and the country, if it (American slavery) is proved to be a divine institution, sanctioned by the word of God,

A portentous infidel philanthropy is rife in the land, false and delusive in its professions, and tending in its consequences to anarchy and misery. Founded not on the love of God, and obedience to his commands, but on wild abstract political theories, it pretends to seek the happiness of mankind by means which can have no influence in purifying the heart, and checking the progress of vice. Those who watch the signs of the times, not from the retirement of their studies, but amid the busy haunts of men know, that the conduct of *many* of the clergy, has given to this spurious philanthropy a mighty and most disastrous impulse.\* They are constantly seen tything mint, and anise, and cummin, and all manner of herbs, while mercy and justice, so far as regards the colored population, are apparently utterly disregarded by them. The public has witnessed a reverend assembly of divines discussing day after day the sinfulness of marrying the sister of a deceased wife, and at last deposing from the ministry a brother who had committed the offence. Yet had this same brother bought another man's wife, used her as his beast of burden, torn from her her children as they became fit for market, and finally disposed of her to some trafficker in human flesh, no ecclesiastical censure would have fallen upon him, and he would have been freely welcomed to the pulpits of the very men who deposed him. We have had pastoral admonitions *against* dancing, and sermons in abundance *in favor* of human bondage; nay, Right Reverend Fathers in God proclaim, that "no man nor set of men in our day, unless they can produce a new revelation from Heaven, are entitled to pronounce slavery *wrong*," and that "slavery as it exists at the present day is agreeable to the order of Divine Providence." We have Bible Societies for supplying the destitute, and our churches and halls resound with eulogiums on the sacred volume; but scarcely a solitary minister at the South is known to suggest, that possibly

---

I AM AN INFIDEL; but gentlemen must pardon me, if I do not adopt their construction of the Bible on this point."

\* This truth is admitted and deplored in a late publication by the Rev. Mr. Patton of Hartford, Conn., entitled, "Pro-Slavery Interpretations of the Bible productive of Infidelity." Says the Rev. author, "Infidels profess to go for a reformation in morals, and they boldly contend that christianity is the chief obstacle in the way of success. They declare that the Church and the Bible are corrupt on the score of morals, and that so far from an argument being derived from that quarter in favor of christianity, the very reverse is true;" and he quotes the following avowal made by an infidel at a recent convention of free-thinkers in New York: "I have done with the old arguments against christianity, and have adopted a more efficient plan. Now, I work altogether through the moral reformations of the day, and through them attack religion, and fine I can accomplish more than by any other means."

the laws which virtually forbid one half of the population to read the Bible, may not be acceptable to its divine author, while the Bible Society of the largest city in the South disclaims all intention of giving Bibles to *slaves*. Great discussions as well as heats are excited by the question whether the word *baptize* or *immerse* shall be inserted in Bibles intended for Heathen in Asia, but the most profound apathy is evinced on the question whether any Bible at all shall be given to the "nation of heathen in our very midst?" Missionaries are sent to the ends of the earth, but to three millions of our own countrymen groaning in bondage, and sunk in ignorance is given only a little "oral instruction," and of that little, no small portion is confined to the duty of obedience, and the sin of running away.

Much is said of the importance of a learned ministry, and contributions are solicited from the pious, to found and maintain Theological Seminaries. Yet no sooner does a candidate for Holy orders apply for the instruction thus provided, than Reverend and Right Reverend Trustees proceed to inspect the *tincture of his skin*, and unless it rises to the orthodox standard, the door of the Seminary is shut in his face. We have in certain quarters, line upon line, and precept upon precept, on the necessity, the importance, the dignity of apostolic succession. But when this "Heavenly gift of ministerial commission," is borne by an ambassador of Christ not colored like themselves, Bishops and Presbyters are seen treating the "heavenly gift" with contumely, rarely if ever admitting the possessor into their pulpits, and scornfully and lawlessly refusing him a seat in the council of the church.

We have among us, a poor, ignorant, persecuted, but unoffending people. They are the least of Christ's brethren, and as such, are specially commissioned by Him to receive in his behalf the tokens of our love and gratitude. Are we taught by our Pastors thus to regard them? Does the noisy demagogue, prating about equal rights and universal suffrage, find no apology for giving the lie to his professions, and trampling upon his colored fellow citizens, in the conduct of the church herself? Will those who drive from the schools of the prophets, youths anxious to qualify themselves for the service of our common Lord, venture to rebuke the inhumanity of the proprietors of our stage coaches, our packets, and our railroads for excluding from their conveyances these unhappy people, however decent their deportment, and however urgent their business? The Jews despised the Samaritans, and were too proud to receive at their hands even a cup of water. But the Savior disregarding an unholy although popular prejudice, eat and drank and lodged with them;

declared to them his divine mission, and in his inimitable parable, selected one of them as an illustration of the great law of love, to the condemnation of the proud and heartless but orthodox Priest and Levite.

Surely it is not surprising that the efforts of so large a portion of the christian ministry to sanctify SLAVERY and CASTE, should give great occasion to the enemies of the Lord to blaspheme, and to His *friends* for grief and perplexity. No small number of those friends, failing to make due allowance for the frailty of our fallen nature, and forgetting the trials arising from the dependence of the clergy on popular support, have rashly and weakly imagined, that the influence of the church is *necessarily* adverse to an enlarged and practical application of the benevolent precepts of the Gospel. Hence they have unhappily indulged the vain expectation that they could cherish more freely the benign impulses of christianity when released from the restraints of ecclesiastical organizations. Such men, by gradually neglecting the appointed means of grace, have made shipwreck of their faith, and listening to the voice of the charmer, and deluding themselves with the belief that they were doing God service, have united with demagogues, scoffers, and infidels in unholy and chimerical schemes of expansive benevolence.

It may well be questioned how far those who by the most solemn vows have dedicated themselves to the service of the sanctuary, can lawfully *confine* their time and labor to the removal of any one moral or political evil. They are to declare the *whole* counsel of God, and to watch over and feed the flocks entrusted to their charge. But the ministers of Christ are faithless to their high and holy mission, when in the name of their master, they give their assent to injustice, and cruelty, and oppression; and *by their own example*, teach their people to despise the poor and helpless. The great head of the church has warned us against that fear of man which bringeth a snare, and demands that his ambassadors shall deliver his message of mercy and love, regardless alike of the displeasure of such as are in high places, and of the scoffs and clamor of the godless multitude. The tree is known by its fruits, and that is not the religion of the Gospel which fails to inculcate glory to God, and peace and good will to men.

WILLIAM JAY.

DECEMBER, 1846